

Appl. No. 09/936,403
Atty. Docket No. CM2083
Amtd. dated 12/05/2003
Reply to Office Action of 9/05/03
Customer number 27752

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-26 and 28-37 are now in the case. Claims 21- 22 are cancelled herewith without prejudice. Claim 20 has been amended to overcome the obviousness rejection as discussed below. Support for this amendment is found on page 4, lines 20 - 23 of the instant specification. Claim 33 has been amended to remove the "preferably" recitation, as a matter of form. This amendment adds no new matter, and entry is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20 -26 and 28 - 37 stand rejected over GB 2,297,977 for the reasons of record stated at pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to presently amended Claims 20, 23 - 26, and 28 - 37. Claims 21 and 22 are cancelled herewith. Hence the rejection with respect to both of these claims is moot.

Nothing in GB '977 suggests clay, surfactant system, solid carrier material, and a flocculating agent being in an intimate mixture with one another. Absent some suggestion or motivation in GB '977 for this requirement, it is submitted that the amended claims now at issue are not obvious in the sense of §103. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection on this basis is requested.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Hall et al.

By


Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

December 5, 2003
Customer No. 27752